











BERGMAIR'S APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL

12

10

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

I, Jason Brown, Esq., hereby state to the best of my personal knowledge and belief:

I am a partner at the law firm of Cohen & Gresser LLP, attorneys of 1. record in the above-referenced actions for specially-appearing Defendant Feras Antoon. I have been granted permission by this Court to appear *pro hac vice* as counsel for Mr. Antoon in these actions.

Confidential Material

- I submit this Declaration in support of the January 8, 2025 Application for Leave to File Under Seal Material (ECF No. 117) (the "Application") filed by Defendant Bernd Bergmair in K.A. v. MindGeek S.a.r.l., Case No. 24-cv-4786-WLH-ADS, and applicable to the 13 additional related lawsuits before this court, see ECF No. 52, Ex. 1 (collectively "Plaintiffs") which seeks permission to seal material previously designated as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential" pursuant to the Amended Stipulated Protective Order (the "Protective Order") entered by the Court on December 13, 2024, Dkt. 516, in the related case, Fleites v. MindGeek S.a.r.l. et al., Case No. 21-cv-4920-WLH-ADS (the "Fleites Action").
- 3. Mr. Antoon supports the Application to the extent it seeks leave to file under seal material that (a) Mr. Antoon produced in discovery in the Fleites Action and designated as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential" pursuant to the Protective Order (together, the "Confidential Material"), or (b) has been referenced in Defendant Bergmair's January 8, 2025 Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (the "Bergmair Reply") (ECF No. 116).
- 4. Mr. Antoon further supports the Application to the extent it seeks leave to file under seal Confidential Material that was both referenced in the

7

4

11

16

14

23

21

Bergmair Reply, and publicly filed on the docket in the form of a document containing redacted Confidential Material proposed to be filed under seal.

5. The Confidential Material reflects confidential information concerning (a) Mr. Antoon's personal investments and assets, including compensation paid for economic interests in MindGeek S.a.r.l.; and (b) MindGeek S.a.r.l.'s internal business strategy or practices, transactions, or corporate structure.

Standard for Sealing В.

- Public access to judicial records may be "denied where court files might [] become a vehicle for improper purposes," including to "gratify private spite or promote public scandal" or to "harm a litigant's competitive standing." Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (internal quotation marks omitted). And the common law right of access to judicial records may be overridden upon a showing of "sufficiently compelling reasons" to restrict access. Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003).
- A party seeking leave to seal confidential information in response to dispositive motions, like the Bergmair Reply, must "articulate []compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings" that outweigh the public right of access. Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks omitted). Upon a showing of compelling reasons, the court must conscientiously balance the competing interests of the public and the party seeking leave to file under seal. *Id.* at 1179.
- 8. Courts have also found compelling reasons to seal records reflecting information concerning a company's business strategy, business transactions, and corporate structure, the public disclosure of any of which could harm a party's competitive standing. See, e.g., Bold Ltd. v. Rocket Resume, Inc., No. 5:22-CV-01045 (BLF), 2024 WL 1329921, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2024) ("Compelling reasons exist to seal confidential business information, including non-public

information about a company's business strategy, business transactions, corporate structure, and finances.").

C. <u>Conclusion</u>

- 9. The Bergmair Reply contains sensitive non-public information implicating either (a) Mr. Antoon's personal financial information or rights in connection with economic interest, or (b) the MindGeek Defendants' internal business strategy or practices, transactions, or corporate structure.
- 10. Accordingly, Mr. Antoon supports Defendant Bergmair's Application seeking leave to seal and/or redact this information from the public record as specified in the below chart.

<u> </u>		
Document	Material to be Sealed	Basis for Sealing
Defendant Bergmair's	Page 2, Lines 4-6;	Defendant
January 8, 2025 Reply in	Page 6, Lines 8-10, 13-20 &	MindGeek's
Support of Motion to	n.9, 24-26; and	business strategy or
Dismiss Plaintiff's	Page 7, Lines 5-8.	practices,
Complaint (ECF No. 116)		transactions, and
		internal structure;
		and Mr. Antoon's
		personal financial
		information or
		rights in
		connection with
		this economic
		interest.

- 11. Mr. Antoon's request to seal is narrowly tailored. A less restrictive alternative to sealing is not sufficient because the entirety of the information sought to be sealed discloses the Confidential Material described above.
- 12. Accordingly, Mr. Antoon respectfully requests that the Court grant the Application.
- 13. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.